

Greg Elmer, Charles H. Davis, Janine Marchessault,
and John McCollough, eds. Locating Migrating
Media. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010, 3-22

Chapter One

Migrating from South to North: The Role of Film Festivals in Funding and Shaping Global South Film and Video

Tamara L. Falicov

This chapter seeks to examine the various kinds of funding made available for global South filmmakers to preproduce, produce and postproduce their typically low-budget films via the international and regional film festival circuit. Film festivals, generally from Europe, have located international development aid and used it to help further artistic films that, according to the Hubert Bals Fund website, "would not otherwise get made" without funding. Although generally speaking, this source of funding, whether it be from the Rotterdam, San Sebastian, Cannes, the Berlinale (Berlin film festival), Sundance or other festivals, has helped further cultural production in countries with medium, small or non-existent film industries, there have been persistent cultural politics stemming from colonial legacies that continue to plague the film funding dynamic, especially in countries in Africa and other former colonial territories.

Film scholarship, broadly speaking, has successfully moved from examining solely the realm of film production to including studies in film exhibition and distribution. That said, very little work has substantively explored a more transitory but no less important form of film circulation and potential distribution outlet: international film festivals. These events have become a critical ve-

hicle for small, low-budget, independent or art house films to secure distribution in the global marketplace. In recent decades this network has been the lifeline for emerging filmmakers from the developing world, such as Latin America, and has served as a showcase for international work to be screened.

Along with the much-needed exposure that world cinema receives in this venue, these festivals now offer the added benefit of enabling new directors to obtain funding in the form of small grants, exemplified by the International Film Festival Rotterdam's (IFFR) Hubert Bals Fund (HBF), which was created in 1988. Gothenberg, Sweden, initiated a similar scheme around the same time, and ten years later Amsterdam's documentary film festival IDFA launched the Jan Vrijman fund (Macnab 2007). In 2004 the Berlinale established the World Cinema Fund. Newer players with film-funding programs include the Miami film festival, as well as Rome, Dubai, and Abu Dhabi, the latter of which has launched an extraordinarily generous \$542-million film-financing initiative (Barber 2007). In addition to film financing through grants and co-production forums, there are fellowships offered by some film festivals, such as the Cannes Film Festival Residence Program and the Sundance Institute artist fellowships and workshops. Finally, there are other support mechanisms, including *Cine en Construcción* (Films in Progress), the multicountry Ibero-American film-finishing fund sponsored by two of the most important Ibero-American film festivals: San Sebastian, Spain, and Toulouse, France. In 2007, the Guadalajara Film Festival joined this initiative.

This chapter seeks to understand the rationale behind the North's push to help fund film and video from the South, and what is at stake when films from the developing world become contenders for the international film festival circuit. Before understanding what is at stake in this South-North funding and exhibition dynamic, we first turn to what kinds of film festivals have helped to spur film/video production in the global South.

International film festivals found in Europe (Rotterdam, Berlin, Cannes), North America (Sundance, Toronto), and in other parts of the world (Buenos Aires, Argentina; Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso; Pusan, South Korea) have functioned as screening venues, markets, educational seminars, funding platforms and a potential place to broker distribution deals for independent filmmakers, especially from small countries with small or practically nonexistent film industries. The festivals themselves compete against one another to premiere the best films and vie for international recognition. Thus film festival directors, programmers and the like function as gatekeepers and think very seriously about which films they wish to showcase. Authors Gupta and Marchessault (2007) note how film festival curators and programmers fear that their products will be homogenous with other festivals, and thus each event engenders original, innovative programming. They state:

Most large film festivals today are competitive in nature. Interestingly, there is a growing intense competition and rivalry that characterizes the many aspects of the festival space. What this denotes in practical terms is that the organizers

or specialized workers at these sites need to both project and protect their own individual events. They need to work hard not only to establish and organize their own particular festival, but also to differentiate it from many other events that now exist in neighboring cities, locally and globally. Specialized festival intermediaries take inspiration and ideas from one another in order to produce an event that is in some sense distinct from the rest. (244–45)

Mark Woods, of the Australian film promotion body Ausfilm, notes that these funding mechanisms, such as small grants for production, strengthen the “film festival brand.” Related to this is the fact that film funds function as a form of patronage that helps produce content for the festival. Adelaide Film Festival director Katrina Sedgwick acknowledges that festival film financing helps their festival to “secure world premieres and to give the event an international profile” (Barber 2007).

Financing and support at international film festivals are part of a larger system that facilitates and encourages the production of what one might call a transnational or global aesthetic that helps films more easily cross boundaries. Marijke de Valck (2006) observes how the films supported by film festivals are groomed for this transnational advantage:

The main advantage of using film festivals as nodes for such industrial support programmes is that they, by definition, transcend national boundaries and, thus, are highly suitable to facilitate a branch that is more and more dependent on co-productions and international investors. They stimulate the transnational approach to cinema, that, nowadays, seems to become a pre-condition for industrial viability, especially for production without a large domestic market. (122)

This emergence of what we might call a film festival aesthetic has its origins in the idea of the Art Cinema genre, when predominantly European films were brought across the Atlantic and were screened in small, art house theaters throughout the United States beginning in the 1960s. Art Cinema, according to Steve Neale, positioned itself in “seeking to counter American domination of their domestic market in film.” Therefore, this kind of cinema had an aesthetic and artistic quality in its narrative or *mise-en-scène* (e.g., Antonioni, Satyajit Ray) that set it apart from typical commercial Hollywood fare, but Neale (1981) also notes that this cinema also had an international dimension to it and gained value in part by the prestige and accolades it garnered in film festivals. He notes:

Art Cinema also, in its cultural and aesthetic aspirations, relies heavily upon an appeal to the ‘universal’ values of culture and art. And this is very much reflected in the existence of international film festivals, where international distribution is sought for these films, and there their status as ‘Art’ is confirmed and re-stated through the existence of prizes and awards, themselves neatly balancing the criteria of artistic merit and commercial potential. (35)

Therefore, in discussing this contemporary film festival aesthetic, how different is it from the art house cinema movement that acted, in a sense, as its predecessor? While the current film festival look might appear to be a continuation of a past, there have been differences for global South filmmakers from the 1960s–70s compared to their counterparts today. Cinema from the global South perhaps gained the most notoriety as a tricontinental movement in the 1960s–70s, when militantly political films dubbed as Third Cinema were shown at film festivals (for example, Viña del Mar, Chile, purportedly the birthplace of a pan-Latin America political film movement known as the New Latin American Cinema). A famous example of a Third Cinema film's reception at a film festival is Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino's 1968 anti-imperialist film essay *Hour of the Furnaces*. The Argentine film played that same year at the Pesaro Film Festival, in Italy, to an energized crowd, which took to the streets in protest following the screening. Third Cinema was a cinema genre not interested in a glossy, universalized aesthetics, but rather a gritty, realist, documentary-style cinema created to raise consciousness and to agitate the viewer into action. (See Buchsbaum for a comprehensive history of the term.)

These Third Cinema films, while popular on college campuses and in leftist intellectual circles in Europe, the United States and other North countries, differed from today's global South films in that Third Cinema films, while given some financial help from European filmmakers and producers (Chris Marker and others), were made more for a domestic audience in mind and were less concerned about the international/global film circuit, perhaps because they were less dependent on it. This could also be a product of the historical era when there were fewer funding channels available from festivals, such as Rotterdam and Berlin, than there are now.

But one could argue that the impact that these festivals have on film today is very positive, e.g., they financially support filmmakers in crucial ways, but these film festivals might also shape today's films in ways that differ quite significantly from the cruder, more political and less self-conscious films of the past. Therefore, it can be argued that networks of funding and exhibition platforms are one factor, among many, that occasioned the shift from the political filmmaking aesthetic from the 1960s to a more artistic, glossy and a smaller, more personal narrative. Moreover, this phenomenon must be contextualized compared to the current political climate, which has been summed up in Michael Chanan's (1997) words: "The original Third Cinema was premised on militant mass political movements of a kind which hardly exist any longer, and upon ideologies which have taken a decisive historical beating. Third Cinema can only survive if it recognizes that it comes from the margins and the interstices." Thus, Third World/global South filmmakers were seen by the West at one time as revolutionary and perhaps now as something different, unconventional, exotic, but in most cases, not as polemic as some of their cinema once was. Lúcia Nagib argues that as European television and entities such as the Sundance Institute began providing funding for Latin American scripts in the 1980s, and con-

tinue to do so, a formula for creating a palatable and successful film scripts in Brazil and other global South countries has been created. She outlines the main tenets in her piece, and I shall briefly summarize her ideas: For scripts to be made and garner international interest, Nagib argues, there needs to be 1) local color, 2) realism, 3) the private hero and 4) the improbable but convincing event. Her examples of films that conform to this narrative structure are Walter Salles's 1998 Brazilian film *Central Station* and Julie Bertucelli's *Since Otar Left*, a 2003 France-Belgium co-production (2006, 96–98).

Thus, in the realm of European sponsorship of global South filmmaking, one could argue that transnationally funded films are shaped to be more universally understood, or how such sponsorship can help reinforce assumptions that Northern audiences might historically have about the South. In some cases, global South filmmakers are asked to change their scripts and ideas to curry favor with international funders. In the case of Africa, Olivier Barlet (2000) argues that African directors often have to battle with producers on matters of content to better guarantee foreign funding. Filmmakers have complained of the artistic compromises with which they've been confronted. In one case a producer who had located international funding asked the director to shift to a location that was "less green, more barren," and in another anecdote a producer offered the use of round huts to a director for a location where there were none, in an attempt to represent stereotypical "Africanness" (267). Barlet believes that the patronage of artistic creation in the countries of the global South is still terribly marked by neocolonialist attitudes in which artists are required to show authenticity. This complicates the notion that wealthy countries reach out to former colonies or poorer nations for goodwill purposes. Instead, there are allegations that the rich aim to commission the exotic on their terms, or to acquire a public relations tool for governmental ministries of external (or foreign) affairs from which a lot of this international development funding emanates. Guinean director Mohamed Camara opines that "people say our cinema doesn't develop because we're always doing the same thing, but when I do something different they tell me it's not African enough" (Barlet 2000, 211).

Foreign funders' involvement in producing and handling film content is also present in the sponsorship (via development aid) of film festivals in the global South. In the most important film festival in Africa, the pan-Africa film festival at Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, there have been criticisms lodged at French funding organizations. Critics have alleged that while French development organizations support festival operations and offer film funding to directors, there has been a failure to help develop local infrastructures, e.g., postproduction facilities, and chief programmer Ardjouma Soma observes that "funders expect a *cinéma de qualité*—though arguably this is incompatible with what is achievable within a sustainable local industry" (Bell 2007, 46).

A key source of development funding for global South cinema comes from France, called *Fonds Sud Cinéma* (Southern Cinema Fund), which is adminis-

tered through the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It was created in 1984 in conjunction with the French Ministry of Culture and the *Centre National de la Cinématographie* (French Film Institute) to help support film production in Southern countries. It is purported to “nurture new filmmakers and favors the production of films that are off the beaten track and display a strong cultural identity. In this sense, Fonds Sud is also a support mechanism for the preservation of cultural diversity” (Osian’s Cinefan 2005). These funds have helped many first-time filmmakers complete their films.¹

While many might praise the work of Fonds Sud, Olivier Barlet argues that funding from Europe not only creates a form of dependency, but also shifts the model of African cinema from a popular, commercial form to an art form that is more widely seen outside the country and by domestic elites, than by the average cinemagoer in Africa. (Other factors contributing to the decline in movie going in Africa include piracy and the closures of movie theaters.) In the case of European funding for African cinema via film festivals or international funding such as Fonds Sud, the artistic model is encouraged, but at the same time, Barlet (2007) notes that there is production funding, but none for distribution, postproduction funding or training in African countries themselves.

Barlet warns that there is a danger of double dependency in promoting an auteurist African cinema that is favored by Fonds Sud, because it tends to be artistic, controversial (i.e., anticolonial, critical of current government corruption, etc.) and/or exotic, and in most cases not compatible with popular and commercial sensibilities in Africa. One dependency problem that arises is that this kind of artistic cinema is fostered externally and there is no domestic market for it. The other dependency that is created is that auteurist directors depend heavily on outside exposure of their films from the international film festival circuit. Global South directors will not necessarily be well known in their countries of origin, and thus depend on foreign recognition to be able to garner investments in future film projects.

Despite these drawbacks, however, it is difficult to be entirely critical of international film funding, when in many cases it is the sole opportunity these filmmakers have to produce works locally. The Indian digital feature film *Suddha: The Cleansing Rites* (P. N. Ramchandra, 2006), was shot entirely in the Tulu language, spoken in two coastal districts in the state of Karnataka, South India. The Hubert Bals Fund enabled the filmmaker to screen the film in these remote areas, where the public was grateful to see a film in their language. The director felt that the grant helped encourage the development of a viewing audience in that area (Tioseco 2007).

Overall, international film festivals lend a Western prestige to new directors, and for the developing world these festivals signify an entry point into what is purported to be “an upwardly mobile, cosmopolitan modernity” and exposure to potential funding sources abroad. Another argument in favor of funding filmmakers in the developing world is that in some cases, like China and Iran,

filmmakers may face governmental restrictions such as censorship or lack of distribution (Macnab 2007).

The following sections will outline some of the funding initiatives established by European and US film festivals with the aim of supporting filmmakers from the global South. It should be noted that in addition to higher-profile, European A-list film festivals, there are also film festivals in Africa, Asia and Latin America that are important places for filmmakers to gather and discuss relevant issues; interestingly, European countries and other wealthy ones often sponsor funding initiatives in film festivals abroad, as well. Certain venues, including Ouagadougou, Mar del Plata (Argentina), Havana, Guadalajara, Pusan and most recently Dubai, are famous in their own right for providing a platform for their national films. Representatives from these various city festivals often organize meetings to which potential distributors from Europe, Japan and the United States are invited to see what is happening at their respective festivals. Here, initiatives such as the Rotterdam film festival's Hubert Bals Fund, cross boundaries and collaborate in more than one film festival (to be discussed further below). Piers Handling, the head of the Toronto Film Festival, notes how film festivals have become an alternative distribution network for the art house/world cinema market (Turan 2002). This becomes compounded when film festivals begin premiering and screening the work that they themselves fund. As Marijke de Valck (2006) notes:

Because such funds are affiliated with film festivals, they are widely acknowledged to have the necessary cultural expertise, which allows for informed decisions on the cultural value of the various projects. In effect, the emergence of specialized festival funds resets the beginning of the process of cultural value addition before the actual festival events. Many film festivals nowadays look beyond the programming and evaluation of finished products and demand a say in which films are artistically interesting, before they are made; and with these funds the festivals, in fact, influence which films will be realized and what (type of) films will be on the market for their [sic] and other festival programmers to choose from. This development adds a whole new layer of meaning to the label "festival film," as these films are not only predominantly produced *for* the festival circuit, but also partially *by* (and with the cultural approval of) the festival circuit. (196)

Hubert Bals Fund

The Hubert Bals Fund (HBF) is a key avenue for filmmakers from the developing world to gain funding and a space to screen their work. Hubert Bals, an ardent supporter of filmmaking from around the globe, founded the Rotterdam film festival in 1971. He served as its first director and felt that films from the developing world were critical to the innovation and a lifeline of art cinema. The Hubert Bals Fund, which was originally to be called the Tarkovsky Fund, was

approved for funding in 1988, the year Hubert Bals died. It is funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dutch NGOs Hivos and NCDO (*Nationale Commissie voor Internationale Samenwerking en Duurzame Ontwikkeling*, or National Committee for International Cooperation and Sustainable Development), the DOEN Foundation and the Dutch public broadcasting network NPS. (See "Hubert Bals Fund" on the Rotterdam film festival website.²) It provides 1.2 million euros annually for script and project development, postproduction and distribution; funds are awarded twice a year. According to the Rotterdam film festival site, since the fund began, close to six hundred projects from independent filmmakers in Asia, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, Africa and Latin America have received support. Approximately 80 percent of these projects have been completed or are currently in production. Clearly, the most valuable aspect of the fund, besides the financial help, is the exposure in an international film festival setting. Daniel Burman, an Argentine filmmaker whose film *Waiting for the Messiah* (2000) received US\$20,000 in postproduction funds, stated that "It's not just the money; receiving their [the fund's] support is a sign of quality for distributors. It makes people take notice of your film" (Hofmann 2005, A4).

Money is awarded based on a film's level of completion. For example, for screenwriters beginning a project, script development funds are available up to 10,000 euros. The awardee is given funding so he or she can dedicate time to complete the script. The Hubert Bals Fund advisors do not dispense advice about the final script unless they are asked (Bhalotra 2007).

Another, relatively new, category is the competition for low-budget digital production. This is a 20,000-euro fund toward the production of a film shot digitally. Recent winners include *At the End of Daybreak* (Ho Yuhang, Malaysia, 2008), *Agrarian Utopia* (Uruphong Raksasad, Thailand, 2009), *Mondomanila* (Khavn de la Cruz, Philippines, 2004), and *Weed* (Wang Liren, China, 2007). A third category involves postproduction funds, and directors in this category have been awarded a maximum of 30,000 euros toward the completion of a film. In Latin America, examples of grant winners for postproduction include Pablo Trapero's *Crane World* (Argentina, 1999), Tata Amaral's *Antonia* (Brazil, 2006), Rodrigo Moreno's *The Minder* (Argentina, 2005), Ruben Imaz Castro's *Turtle Family* (Mexico, 2006), Chico Teixeira's *Alice's House* (Brazil, 2007) and Alexis Dos Santos's *Glue* (Argentina, 2006).

Julian Stringer (2003) has pointed out that it is estimated that as many as 70 percent of the films shown at film festivals never find theatrical distribution outside their countries of origin. This may be true with respect to the industrialized world, but is not necessarily the case in the developing world. The HBF staff found that despite winning international awards, filmmakers often were not given film distribution, even within their own country. For this reason, a new category was developed whereby 15,000 euros would be awarded to projects for new prints (copies) to be struck. With optical prints made, producers would then be in a better position to negotiate a distribution or exhibition deal so the film

could be screened in the country of origin. Some recent distribution award winners include Alicia Scherson's *Play* (Chile, 2005), Joana Hadjithomas and Khalil Joreige's *A Perfect Day* (Lebanon, 2005), and Manuel Nieto Zas's *The Dog Pound* (Uruguay, 2006).

In some cases, Hubert Bals funding is given to film festivals in emerging countries to help with screenwriting workshops. In 2002, for example, workshops in Indonesia, Trinidad and Bosnia were funded. Other script and co-production competitions linked to festivals include the Carthage Film Festival in Tunisia; the Cinemanila International Film Festival in Manila, the Philippines; the Jakarta International Film Festival in Indonesia and the Hong Kong International Film Festival. In some cases, the Hubert Bals Fund provides prize money for winning films. In addition, there are other prizes available to winners through funding from Sweden's Gothenberg Film Festival Fund and the IDFA, the International Documentary Film Festival in Amsterdam. For example, at the Jakarta film festival, a five-day script-development workshop is offered, and at the end, various awards are given to the top contenders: one is an award for feature film script development underwritten by the HBF, and a feature-length documentary script award is sponsored by the Jan Vrijman Fund (linked to the IDFA). At the Sarajevo film festival, there are script development workshops every April and June in preparation for the film festival in August. The Pusan International Film Festival in Korea also has a Hubert Bals-style program on a smaller scale known as the New Directors in Focus, where four awards are given totaling US\$30,000 (Elley 2001).

In addition to supporting individual filmmakers, the Hubert Bals Fund supports organizations that work to exhibit and distribute films in the rural areas of Latin America and Africa. Grupo Chaski from Peru, along with producer Stefan Kaspar, launched a microcinema network in 2004 to provide spaces for Peruvians to watch films outside the Lima film circuits. An alternative circuit was set up as a result of the closures of many movie theaters in Peru, with a disproportionate amount in the cities and towns outside Lima. As Paola Reategui notes, the locations of existing theaters since 2007 have been "typically close to supermarkets and malls and 95 percent of tickets are sold to US films. Ticket prices have risen, putting them out of reach for the majority of the population" (Reategui cited in McClennan 2008). This microcinema project aims to provide Peruvians living in the more remote areas of the country with more access to mainly Latin American films and to take advantage of advances in digital technology, but also "to promote the film experience as a moment of reflection, debate, and critical exchange" (McClennan 2008).

The Hubert Bals Fund also grants funds to people like Kaspar, a producer who has created a portfolio of ten DVDs of Latin American films. He travels to remote villages throughout Peru with a small screen and DVD player. To the assembled villagers, he introduces the films and engages them in discussion. In South Africa, the HBF supports the Film Resource Unit, in which a South Afri-

can NGO runs a mobile cinema to screen films in the townships and rural areas of Namibia and Zimbabwe. The purpose of the portable cinema is to enable native Africans to see images of themselves and to strengthen their cultural identity (Bhalostra 2007).

Other forms of distribution include a tour of award-winning Hubert Bals films that travels around the Netherlands, playing at area movie theaters. Ultimately, if HBF-funded films are not granted European distribution, the Rotterdam film festival retains the rights to the films for the Netherlands and Belgium, with a DVD release that is sold at subsequent film festivals. In addition, Dutch public television is committed to screening at least five HBF-supported films a year.

A great number of films supported by Hubert Bals are premiered by the Rotterdam festival, thus creating another level of support. However, not all films are selected to be screened at the festival. The few that the program curators deem of poor artistic quality are not shown, and a few films that gain attention from other festivals have sidestepped Rotterdam in the past, such as the recent case of Argentine director Ariel Rotter's film *The Other*, 2007, which opted to premiere at the Berlinale, where it won a Silver Bear for best actor (Julio Chavez) and the grand jury award. In this specific case, Rotter's film was funded by both the Hubert Bals Fund and the Berlin film festival's Berlinale World Cinema Fund. Thus, while many European film festivals want to support emerging directors from the global South, they are also in direct competition to premiere the work, and ultimately succeed in terms of worldwide prestige and continued economic viability.

Berlinale World Cinema Fund

The Berlinale World Cinema Fund (BWCF), subsidized in part by the German Federal Cultural Foundation, was created to support filmmakers from what they call "transition" countries. Until recently, as mentioned on the BWCF website, the fund supported filmmakers from Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia. In February 2007, they announced an expansion of the focus regions to Southeast Asia and the Caucasus regions (Berlinale World Cinema Fund website³). Funds are available for the production of feature-length fiction and documentary films, and distribution funds exist for films from these countries to be distributed in Germany.

The Berlin film festival also offers a six-day creative summit for new filmmakers, which takes place concurrent with the Berlinale each year. This program started in 2003 and has hosted over 2,500 participants from five continents. The delegates participate in workshops, lectures and activities, which include interaction with expert actors, directors and producers from all over the world (Berlinale Talent Campus website⁴ 2007).

Sundance Institute Support

A North American festival offering developmental support for international scripts is the Sundance Film Institute. Their Sundance Film Institute/NHK International Filmmakers Award offers four grants to filmmakers from the following regions: one grant each to a filmmaker from the United States, Latin America, Europe and Japan. Latin American films such as Walter Salles's *Central Station* (Brazil, 1998), Fernando Pérez's *Life is to Whistle* (Cuba, 1998) and Lucrecia Martel's *The Swamp* (Argentina, 2001) were all supported with Sundance Screenwriters Lab support. The Sundance Institute also offers funds for the production of international documentaries and the chance to participate in the Feature Film Program (which encompasses the Screenwriters and Directors labs) for filmmakers in the targeted regions of the Middle East, China and Northern Africa (see the Sundance Institute website⁵).

Lúcia Nagib, as mentioned previously, has examined how script competition has affected the success of films made in Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Mexico and others in the Middle East and the Balkans. She notes that Brazil in particular underwent a script boom as a result of award competition opportunities from the Sundance Lab and Hubert Bals Fund, along with television channels such as Canal+ in Belgium and Fabbrica in Italy (2006, 95). In other words, these external opportunities for script funding have helped spur artistic creation and have created a cottage industry with an opportunity to potentially circulate films internationally.

The Cannes Residence Program

The Cannes Residence Program, established in 2000, offers twelve fellowships per year for young international filmmakers to come to Paris for four and a half months to complete a first or second screenplay. They are given accommodations and opportunities to meet various film industry professionals who help guide them toward completing their work. Grantees are given access to the French film institute, are given discounted rates to local theaters and are allotted a monthly stipend of 750 euros (see the Festival de Cannes website⁶). In spring 2007, six young directors from Georgia, Turkey, Malaysia, Iran, Israel and Argentina were selected for the program. Of those selected, four were women ranging in age from 28 to 34. This is notable given the worldwide dearth of female directors in the film industry. Past fellowship recipients include Josué Mendez, director of the critically acclaimed Peruvian film *Días de Santiago* (2004). He has since been able to raise funds through private sources to make a second film, *Dioses* (*Gods*, 2008). Interestingly enough, the funds for this fellowship come from the private sector, with the support of large companies, in-

cluding L'Oréal, Nestlé and Time Warner (James 2001). Most likely, these companies, who have no affiliation with the film industry, may gain some prestige if they are seen to support nascent artistic development from the global South.

When the North "Discovers" the South

The film festival circuit is a privileged one—it involves being discovered or selected as one out of many applications. The hope is that a "foreign" filmmaker's work is understandable and can cross borders (as opposed to a film that is too local, due to such elements as inside humor, political references and traditional or popular folklore) and thus be accessible to what is considered a universal, typically educated audience (as in the Weberian "ideal type"). These filmmakers may be selected via a scouting process, not unlike the athletic recruiters who travel to Central America and elsewhere to locate the best baseball players and bring them to the North. The artistic scouts comprise the curators from film festivals who attend screenings in countries such as the Philippines and Malaysia (to name two countries well represented in Rotterdam's 2007 film festival). In a sense, these programmers hope to locate films and directors with promise. This, too, will ensure that their respective film festivals have some measure of distinction and originality. In the case of the six Malaysian films screened at the 2007 Rotterdam film festival, it was interesting to see how these films represented different facets of Malaysian society, for example, the Malaysian Chinese and the Hindu minority community. Clearly, the programmers were interested in showing various facets of life in these countries, rather than a majoritarian view. This is laudable because it is democratic, but it also might give us an insight into the types of films that would prop up the Rotterdam festival image—that of finding an artistic expression of the marginalized within the marginalized in a Third World, and in the case of indigenous groups, Fourth World, society.

When a film from a developing country is selected, this increases a director's access to funding, travel and other opportunities that typically only wealthy Third World elites otherwise can access. Latin American filmmakers seen at national or regional festivals in their home cities (e.g., Guadalajara, Pusan, Ouagadougou, Sarajevo) may be given access to a larger, international venue. And even if a film is not picked up for distribution there, the hope is that at least it will travel to other festivals (Steinhart 2006).

European and US film festivals will often place attention on smaller film industries from emerging countries, such as the recent attention paid to Romanian cinema and the purported "Romanian New Wave," which has come to be associated with young directors like Cristian Mungiu, Cristi Puiu, Catalin Mitulescu and the late Cristian Nemescu. These directors from peripheral film industries are in essence discovered via these film festivals and lauded internationally

when prizes are bestowed on them. Julian Stringer, film scholar, (2003) is critical of Euro-American film critics and historians who write about how a non-Western film is discovered when it is shown at a film festival. But the above-mentioned author also acknowledges that non-Western directors depend on international film festival exposure to gain access to markets, and this distribution channel ultimately lends itself to funding for future film production. Recognition from abroad often translates into funding from a filmmaker's state film institute (if one exists) or from private monies abroad or at home. In some cases, the filmmaker is better known and recognized outside his or her country than in it, like Gloria Rolando from Cuba, who worked to screen her work in and raise funds from the United States, Europe, Canada and South Africa.

In addition to film funds given to first-time filmmakers, there are forms of co-production financing to help filmmakers complete and exhibit films. There are many film festivals that facilitate meetings between producers, funders, distributors and the like in what are known as co-production markets. The Rotterdam film festival's CineMart is the oldest of these markets, and it has since become a victim of its own success as there are now many iterations of these annual events at international film festivals. The following explains how these markets work, and how filmmakers from the South benefit from this type of funding.

CineMart and Other Co-Production Markets

Rotterdam's co-production film market, CineMart, was created in 1983 when film festival organizers realized that, in their words, "filmmakers and the international film industry were not so much in need of a market in Rotterdam to buy and sell finished films. Rather there was a need for a platform to present film projects looking for additional financing" ("CineMart History," Rotterdam film festival website⁷). CineMart works as a highly efficient catalyst and matchmaker in the filmmaking process. The organization invites a select group of co-producers, television buyers, sales agents, distributors and fund representatives to meet up with project representatives for a five-day event that coincides with IFFR. CineMart acts as a clearinghouse whereby many industry professionals interested in co-producing or distributing a film come together. In 2007, participants numbered 1,500, and in that same year of 420 film directors who applied, only 45 were selected by the CineMart staff and Rotterdam film festival curators. Some of the applications are solicited by the CineMart staff, who attend film festivals throughout the year and meet producers and directors working on their next projects. If they see promise in a filmmaker, they encourage them to apply (Taal and Elshout 2007). CineMart is positioned for film projects that are more developed than the ones funded by the Hubert Bals Fund. Industry professionals come from all over the world but must be invited to attend. Some

of the recent distributors who have participated in CineMart are Miramax UK, The Weinstein Company, Zeitgeist and Film Four (UK), to name a few ("CineMart 2007: If It Ain't Broke"). After the project selection is completed, the CineMart staff create a dossier with information about each project. Attending professionals then inform CineMart of their interests and a master meeting schedule is set up. Upon arrival in Rotterdam, all guests receive their personal meeting schedule. During CineMart 2007, there were about 7,500 meetings between project representatives and potential financiers (CineMart website 2007).

Funding via CineMart helped Argentine filmmaker Pablo Trapero's script for *Born and Bred* (2006) to obtain funding by Argentina/Spain/France and Rodrigo Moreno's *The Minder* (2005) to be co-produced by Argentina/Germany. Trapero is considered a model filmmaker for the IFFR because he completed his first film, *Crane World* (1999), with a grant from Hubert Bals and later was invited to CineMart a few times with various film projects. At Rotterdam, the hope is that filmmakers can evolve from Hubert Bals to bigger-budget co-produced films through CineMart. Agreements with the Berlin film festival, the Independent Film Project (IFP) film market in New York and the Paris Cinema see a number of CineMart projects head over to those events each year and help speed up completion of the films, which generally take between three and five years (Foreman 2007).

A smaller-scale version of CineMart is the Rotterdam Lab, a three-day training ground for new producers. Comanager Marit van den Elshout describes the lab as, "our forum for young producers who need festival experience and market guidance" ("CineMart 2007: If It Ain't Broke," 3). Young producers are selected by organizations with which CineMart has a relationship, such as the Asia-Europe Foundation, the Australian Film Commission, the National Film Development Corporation (India) and the National Film and Video Foundation (South Africa). (See "CineMart Partners" on the Rotterdam film festival website⁸.)

CineMart has also been replicated on a smaller scale at the Sarajevo film festival to encourage the development of feature film production in the Balkan/Southeastern European region. The Cinelink Co-Production Market spans three days of the Sarajevo film festival, attracts over 300 industry professionals, both regionally and internationally, and culminates in awards sponsored by the Hubert Bals Fund and the Gothenberg Film Festival. A similar program has occurred at the Cape Town World Cinema Festival with awards cosponsored by the above-mentioned Dutch and Swedish film festivals.

Moreover, CineMart has spawned similar initiatives at competing festivals, for example, the Berlin film festival's Berlinale Co-Production Market, the Producers Network at the Marché du Film at Cannes and two newer entries into the world scene, the New Cinema Network at the Rome film festival and the Dubai International Film Festival. The Dubai festival was founded in 2004 and sponsors the Dubai Film Connection, a co-production market for Arab filmmakers. Annually, the Dubai Film Connection selects makers of ten films that are in var-

ious stages of production to meet with international and regional financiers, distributors, sales agents, and television broadcasters. Another such example is the Buenos Aires International Independent Film Festival's Buenos Aires Lab, a seminar that supports the development and production of independent films from Latin America by creating a meeting place for co-production funding, similar to CineMart. Funding comes from the film festival itself and the TyPA Foundation (which has received funds from the HBF).

The film festival at Locarno, Switzerland, runs the co-production event matching global South producers with their European counterparts (Macnab 2007). At the film festival in Huelva, Spain, there is a forum for co-production, which helps to pair Spanish producers with their compatriot directors and/or directors from Latin American countries.

The Pusan film festival in Korea has its own version of CineMart called the Pusan Promotion Plan (PPP). Initiated in 1998, this co-production market is made available for a select group of filmmakers and producers throughout Asia (including Tajikistan and other nations in Asia Minor). The PPP has shared partnerships with International Film Festival Rotterdam's CineMart, the Hong Kong Asia Film Financing Forum and the Producer Network of Marché du Film at Cannes. Since 2006, the PPP has formed a project exchange agreement with the IFP's No Borders International Co-Production Market to select and exchange two recommended projects each year. Pusan holds the largest co-production event in Asia (see the Pusan Promotion Plan website 2007).

Finishing Funds through Film Festivals: The Case of Cine en Construcción

An initiative that specifically assists Latin American filmmakers toward completion of their films is called *Cine en Construcción* (Films in Progress). Jointly organized by two European film festivals, the San Sebastian Film Festival (Spain) and the Latin American Film Festival in Toulouse (France), it was founded in 2002 and is the first time that two European film festivals have united to support Latin American and Spanish filmmakers in need of postproduction finishing funds (see "Qué Es Cine en Construcción?" 2007). Twice a year, film professionals and festival staff in Toulouse and San Sebastian screen fictional feature film entries that are works in progress. The winning films obtain postproduction completion funding through donations from various film companies, e.g., Exa, Kodak, Molinare, No Problem Sonido, Technicolor-Madrid Film Lab and Titra Film. Out of roughly forty-plus entries each year, the committee selects between four and eight films for funding. Upon their completion, many of the selected films have gone on to screen at one or both of the festivals. This opportunity for Latin American filmmakers to have access to the European market and possibly gain notice in that realm could establish future funding chan-

nels and ensure continuing film financing. A few veteran filmmakers throughout Latin America, through exposure at film festivals and with access to theatrical distribution, can now be assured co-production funding and distribution deals with Spain.⁹ A few Cine en Construcción winners have screened at the Cannes film festival, for example, Ana Katz's *A Stray Girlfriend* (Argentina-Spain, 2007), César Charlone and Enrique Fernández's *The Pope's Toilet* (Uruguay-Brazil, 2005) and Marcelo Gomes's *Cinema, Aspirins, and Vultures* (Brazil, 2005). In 2007, the Guadalajara International Film Festival joined Cine en Construcción to help support postproduction and make it a tripartite film-finishing fund representing both Europe and Latin America.

Conclusion

International film festivals are supporting filmmakers from the global South in production, exhibition and distribution aspects of film and video production. This is undoubtedly a significant avenue of support to those filmmakers who come from countries with little state or private support for cinema, as well as to those who come from countries which have only fledgling film industries. Creating a network in the North helps foster these films from the global South and helps them gain worldwide exposure, but at the same time it necessarily creates a power dynamic between the filmmaker and the funder who may have a Western audience in mind and may shape the narrative content and/or aesthetic quality to more broadly appeal to that market.

That said, one might see that despite a power dynamic, there is also the formation of a symbiotic relationship between the filmmakers and festival organizers and funders. Filmmakers from the global South, especially first-time directors, rely on this financial support and access to wider markets. The film festivals rely on these directors for new, "exotic" and innovative content. Hubert Bals has noted, "The future of cinematography is not to be expected from Europe or the United States, but all the more from lesser known film cultures" (quoted in Steinhart 2006). The "discovery" of new film aesthetics notwithstanding, the exhibition of these films, patronized by the festivals themselves, helps Northern film festivals be cutting-edge and novel. For the filmmakers, it has been crucial for Southern works to find their way to European, US, Australian and Canadian festivals, but it has been equally important for workshops, e.g., scriptwriting, to be made available in countries of origin (South Africa, Indonesia, etc.), laudably carried out mainly by Dutch and Swedish film festival funders. While it may be true that the South needs opportunities and support from the North to survive, it is equally true, in Saidian terms, that the North needs the South to be *avant la lettre*.

Notes

1. However, a drawback to this fund is that a large part of the funding is given for such activities as postproduction work completed in France, hiring French technicians for central crew positions (director of photography, for example) or dubbing the film into French. African filmmakers have alleged that funds such as this will never help nascent film industries develop their infrastructure, to the point where one critic pointed out that ultimately it is the French film industry that is being subsidized (Barlet 2000).

2. http://www.filmfestivalrotterdam.com/en/about/hubert_bals_fund.aspx.

3. http://www.berlinale.de/en/das_festival/world_cinema_fund/wcf_profil/index.html.

4. <http://www.berlinale-talentcampus.de/>.

5. <http://www.sundance.org/>.

6. <http://www.festival-cannes.com/en.html>.

7. http://www.filmfestivalrotterdam.com/professionals/cinemine/cinemart_history.aspx.

8. http://www.filmfestivalrotterdam.com/professionals/cinemine/cinemart_partners.aspx.

9. Film directors Fernando Pérez from Cuba, Adolfo Aristarain from Argentina and more recently Lucrecia Martel, also from Argentina, are clear examples. For a deeper understanding of the politics of film funding between Spain and Latin America, see Falicov 2007.

References

- Barber, Lyden. 2007. Beyond the primal screen: Festivals have taken to bankrolling the film industry. *The Australian*, November 22, www.theaustraliannews.com.au/story/0,25197,2271393815803,00.html (accessed December 6, 2007).
- Barlet, Olivier. 2000. *African cinemas: Decolonizing the gaze*. London: Zed Books.
- . 2007. Cinema: An audience but no market. February 23, translated from the French by Sameena Black. <http://www.sudplanete.net/index.php?menu=arti&no=5851> (accessed May 28, 2008).
- Bell, James. 2007. Lights in the dust. *Sight and Sound* 17, no. 5 (May): 44–46.
- Berlinale Talent Campus website, <http://www.berlinale-talentcampus.de/story/62/1862.html> (accessed December 23, 2007).
- Berlinale World Cinema Fund website, http://www.berlinale.de/en/das_festival/world_cinema_fund/wcf_profil/index.html (accessed December 21, 2007).
- Bhalostra, Marianne. 2007. Personal interview with the head of the Hubert Bals Fund, January.
- Buchsbaum, Jonathan. 2001. A closer look at third cinema. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio, and Television* 21, no. 2 (June): 153–66.
- Chanan, Michael. 1997. The changing geography of third cinema. *Screen* (Special Latin American Issue) 38, no. 4 (winter): 372–88.
- CineMart website, <http://professionals.filmfestivalrotterdam.com/eng/cinemine/profile.aspx> (accessed December 23, 2007).
- CineMart 2007: If it ain't broke. 2007. *Daily Tiger* #4, 28 (January): 3.
- De Valck, Marijke. 2006. Film festivals: History and theory of a European phenomenon that became a global network. PhD diss., University of Amsterdam.
- Elley, Derek. 2001. Pusan plans top Asia helmers. *Variety* 348, no. 8, October 8: 18.
- Elsaesser, Thomas. 2005. *European cinema: Face to face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam University Press.
- Falicov, Tamara L. 2007. Programa ibermedia: Co-production and the cultural politics of constructing an Ibero-American audiovisual space. *Spectator* (Special Issue on Media Co-Productions) 27, no. 2: 21–30.
- Foreman, Liza. 2007. CineMart hits its stride. *Daily Tiger* #6, no. 30 (January): 21.
- Gupta, Dipti, and Janine Marchessault. 2007. Film festivals as urban encounter and cultural traffic. In *Urban enigmas: Montreal, Toronto, and the problem of comparing cities*, ed. Johanne Sloan, 239–54. Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Hofmann, Katja. 2005. Berlin film fest: Fest funds team up to boost world cinema. *Variety* 397, no. 12, February 7–13: A4, A10.
- Hubert Bals Fund: Realizing dreams. http://professionals.filmfestivalrotterdam.com/eng/hubert_bals_fund/hubert_bals_profile.aspx (accessed December 23, 2007).
- James, Alison. 2001. Cannes residence homes in on new talent. *Variety*, May 7–13: C14, C16.
- Macnab, Geoffrey. 2007. New crowned hope: Film funds: Cinema's tap in the desert. *Sight and Sound* 17, no. 7 (July): 38.

- Mazdon, Lucy. 2006. The Cannes film festival as transnational space. *Post Script* 25, no. 2 (winter–spring): 19–31.
- McClennen, Sophia A. 2008. The theory and practice of Peruvian Grupo Chaski. *Jump Cut: A Review of Contemporary Media* no. 50 (spring) <http://www.ejumpcut.org/currentissue/Chaski/text.html> (accessed June 2, 2008).
- Nagib, Lúcia. 2006. Going global: The Brazilian scripted film. In *Trading culture: Global traffic and local cultures in film and television*, ed. Sylvia Harvey, 95–104. Easleigh, UK: John Libbey Publishing.
- Neale, Steve. 1981. Art cinema as institution. *Screen* 22, no. 1: 11–39.
- Osian's Cinefan 7th Festival of Asian Cinema website. 2005. Festival selection, Fonds Sud: Asia selection. <http://www.cinemaya.net/c7-fond.asp> (accessed July 7, 2006).
- Pusan Promotion Plan website, http://ppp.asianfilmmarket.org/eng/05news/view_news_notice.asp?idx=25&no=20 (accessed December 11, 2007).
- Qué es Cine en Construcción? www.sansebastianfestival.com/2005/es/cineen01.htm (accessed December 21, 2007).
- Steinhart, Daniel. 2006. Fostering international cinema: The Rotterdam Film Festival, CineMart, and the Hubert Bals Fund. *Mediascape: A Journal of the Critical Studies Program at the UCLA School of Film, TV, and Digital Media* no. 2 (spring): 1–13.
- Stringer, Julian. 2003. Neither one thing nor another: Blockbuster at film festivals. In *Movie blockbusters*, ed. Julian Stringer, 202–13. London: Routledge.
- . 2001. Global cities and the international film festival economy. In *Cinema and the city: Film and urban societies in a global context*, eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice, 134–44. London: Blackwell.
- Sundance Film Institute website, www.sundance.org (accessed December 6, 2007).
- Taal, Bianca, and Marit van den Elshout. 2007. Personal interview with the codirectors of CineMart, January.
- Tioseco, Alexis. 2007. Funding world cinema....Culture? 25 September, <http://alexistioseco.wordpress.com/2007/09/25/funding-world-cinemaculture/> (accessed December 23, 2007).
- Turan, Kenneth. 2002. *Sundance to Sarajevo: Film festivals and the world they made*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

The author would like to acknowledge the Hall Center for the Humanities at the University of Kansas for support on this project. Many thanks to my colleagues Giselle Anatol, Ann Wierda Rowland and Kim Warren for their helpful feedback.